



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(p. 43). Aristotle criticizes most severely the situation which results when someone, though aware of the relationship, seems about to do his kinsman a deadly injury and refrains; such a situation occurs in *Hamlet*, III, iii (p. 47). Baseness beyond what is necessary for the plot is seen in the Edmund and Regan of *King Lear*; inappropriateness to the manly type in the title rôle of *King Richard II*, and to the womanly in the clever speech of Portia at the trial in *The Merchant of Venice*; and inconsistency in the Oliver at the beginning and end of *As You Like It* (p. 50). Both external tokens and reasoning are used to bring about a recognition in *The Winter's Tale* (pp. 53 and 57), and a display of feelings caused by memory is employed for the same purpose in *Paradise Lost*, IV (p. 55). Failure to visualize the action accounts for certain inconsistencies in *King Lear* (p. 58). Shakespeare is a poet of the plastic sort, Marlowe one with the touch of madness (p. 59). The meaning of what Aristotle called the intellectual element is clearly elucidated from Claudius, Iago, and Hamlet (pp. 64 f.). Satan's speeches in *Paradise Lost* illustrate the difference between the morally good and the artistically good in literature (p. 88). How far these parallels are new needs no detailed consideration here. I judge that Professor Cooper himself would not claim originality for all of them. Certainly few of them lie beyond the ken of the ordinary classical scholar. It might be expected that a specialist in another department would be able to enlighten us more. But perhaps Hiltz's dictum holds true here: "Truth, wherever it may be sought, is, as a rule, so simple that it does not look learned enough."

Roy C. FLICKINGER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Dioniso: Saggio sulla religione e la parodia religiosa in Aristofane.

By A. CARLO PASCAL. Catania: Francesco Battiato, 1911.
Pp. xv+259. L. 5.

This book is a series of graceful essays, conceived in a popular manner, though fortified with a considerable apparatus of footnotes, about one-third of which is devoted to Dionysus and the Mysteries in partial justification of the main title. The author has a contagious admiration for Aristophanes, and enlivens his pages with an occasional exclamation of pleasure and approval.

Pascal's general conclusions are substantially sound. He expresses them thus: "That the elements of the comic representation of different divine personages were already contained in embryo in literary and popular tradition, and markedly so in tragedy" (referring here especially to the satyr plays; cf. pp. 57 ff.); ". . . that Aristophanes, like so many others of the ancients, has a purely political conception of religion," whence, given his passionate local patriotism, it follows that "the satire of the poet is implacable

against gods of foreign origin," and in him "the Athenian prejudice is dominant, subordinating to itself every other spiritual activity and every other conception, even in the field of the religious life" (pp. 252 f.). The strength of the work lies in its lucid narrative and exposition, and in its happy characterization of the spirit of Aristophanic satire, and it should be greatly appreciated by a cultured reading public which has not perhaps wholly disappeared as yet upon the Continent.

The specialist also will find not a few interesting theories and interpretations. Some will undoubtedly commend themselves, as, for example, the combination of frgg. 645 and 655 of Koch's edition (p. 156), and the really brilliant argument that the mysterious hero Orestes of the *Acharnians* and the *Birds* can be understood only in connection with the Orestes of the *Xóes* and the peculiar ritual of that feast. Pascal conjectures with great plausibility that originally some man feigning intoxication, i.e., possession by the god, stripped and beat (as at the Lupercalia) chance comers in an act of lustration. Certainly the old footpad theory is demolished, whether applied in a generic or a specific sense, even if the new view may not quite amount to a demonstration.

Most of the contributions, however, can neither inspire confidence or claim plausibility. Pascal belongs to that school, which, though growing less numerous, will probably never disappear, that persists in taking Aristophanes quite too seriously as a reformer. With such a presupposition you may support almost any contention from some portion of his works, but very few indeed from the whole. Pascal's whole treatment of Dionysus, for example, is vitiated by the assumption of a serious ulterior motive. We may grant that Aristophanes was violently opposed to strange gods, and in the **Ωpai* would eradicate them root and branch, but it is quite inconceivable that he should have been *un oppositore dei riti dionisiaci* (p. 45), and have regarded Dionysus wholly as *un dio barbaro* (p. 65), *falso e bugiardo* (p. 33), or that he saw in the cult merely "a symbol of the triumph of democracy and a menace to social order" (p. 47). Aristophanes was a moderate democrat himself; surely no one can doubt that after Croiset. And if Dionysus plays a stupid and silly rôle in the *Frogs*, yet the phallic procession of the rural Dionysia in the *Acharnians* is treated with genuine sympathy and approval. Besides, if to laugh at Dionysus meant to attack the very cult itself, as was the case with Sabazius, then Aristophanes must have had sinister designs upon the cults of Zeus, Hermes, and Herakles, not to mention others who are treated, Zeus in particular, certainly no better than Dionysus. Again, whatever the early status of Dionysus among the Olympians, he had been worshiped in the countryside from almost immemorial antiquity, his cult being associated with many of the oldest names in Attic constructed history, while his worship had been established for nearly a century and a half in Athens itself, and without it the very existence of tragedy and comedy would have been inconceivable. That Euripides calls Dionysus *μαρώτατ'*

ἀνθρώπων means nothing in view of the fact that Poseidon and Plutus are addressed by the same phrase (*Birds* 1638 and *Plutus* 78). Finally, if Aristophanes' ridicule of Dionysus is to be taken seriously, then a general conspiracy on the part of the whole guild of comic poets to overthrow the worship of Dionysus must be assumed, for they had crowded the boards with representations of "a hungry Heracles, a cowardly Dionysus, and an adulterous Zeus" (schol. to the *Peace* 741), while Eupolis, Crates, and many another showed a marked preference for making Dionysus the butt of their jibes.

Again, it seems quite impossible that the *Frogs* is a counterblast to the *Bacchae*, as Pascal labors at great length to establish (pp. 36 ff.), partly because the *Bacchae* was certainly not produced at Athens before the *Frogs*, and it is improbable that Aristophanes could have known about its contents while composing his play, and partly because there is no direct reference where such would have been eminently in place, and the supposed "indirect" references are wholly vague and inconclusive. One might observe in passing that Koch, on the basis of vs. 320 and W. Schmid on that of vs. 631, had suggested the possibility of a reference to the *Bacchae*, but Pascal does not use either of these passages, and seems to be unaware that the suggestion had been made before.

It is difficult likewise to accept the identification of Basileia in the *Birds* with the Queen of the Nether World (pp. 99 ff.). This Basileia has no attributes of a death-goddess, but resides with Zeus in heaven; she is wholly unknown to Pithetaerus and is so described and treated as to make it quite clear that she is a mere invention of the poet, devised in part to symbolize the transfer of sovereignty from the gods to the birds, and especially to bring the play to a brilliant conclusion with a wedding-feast somewhat like that of Trygaeus and Opora in the *Peace*. Finally, the suggestion that a marriage with Basileia as Queen of Death meant a sudden transfer to the next world is both too subtle and wholly out of keeping with the context.

Pascal can hardly be right in claiming that Asclepius is made the object of ridicule in the *Plutus* (pp. 169 ff.). To be sure, as a physician the god must put up with some bad smells, but his treatment of Plutus is a pronounced success, and Neoclides gets his just deserts. Whatever satire there is falls on the priests; but that is a very different matter.

The last chapter is devoted to an unsuccessful attempt to prove that Socrates "of the first manner" was really a physical scientist, as depicted in the *Clouds*. This view is based primarily on the assumption that Aristophanes was incapable of a serious misrepresentation (p. 238), a position amply refuted by the notorious unfairness of his treatment of Pericles and Euripides, to mention no others. The supplementary arguments are for the most part quite inconclusive. Certainly such a comparison as that of the *μαίενσις* with the miscarriage of the idea when Strepsiades knocked rudely at the door of the *φροντιστήριον*, or of *Δίνος* with the *οὐράνιαι δίναι νεφέλας*

δροπαιόν of the *Alcestis*, is very far from constituting substantial evidence.

A few obvious slips like the statement that the *Protagoras* of Plato was earlier than the *Birds* (p. 148, note 1), that Polycrates wrote a defense of Socrates rather than an accusation (p. 237), or the assumption that the *Kauvóv* in the *Wasps*, vs. 120, was a center of Corybantic worship instead of a law court (p. 171), while not seriously affecting the argument, do nevertheless, in conjunction with the astonishingly numerous misprints in citations from Greek texts, mar somewhat the appearance of the book, at least for the fastidious.

W. A. OLDFATHER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Baehrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II, fasc. 3. *Homerus Latinus.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. Pp. x+65. M. 2.

Zum Homerus Latinus. Kritischer Apparat mit Commentar und Überlieferungsgeschichte. Von F. VOLLMER. Sitzungsberichte der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse. Jahrgung 1913, 3. Abhandlung. Pp. 152. M. 3.

We have in these two publications the mature fruit of collections and studies that extend over some fifteen years. Briefly to summarize the formal contributions to the text criticism of the *Homerus Latinus*, all eight manuscripts used by Baehrens have been recollated, and, as one familiar with this side of his work might readily believe, numerous corrections made; six hitherto unused manuscripts of the tenth to the twelfth century have been added, one of which, discovered by Vollmer himself at Antwerp, together with a manuscript of Valenciennes, constitutes a wholly independent arm of the tradition; seven of the earliest editions between 1477 and 1513 have been examined, and selected readings from them reported; a full list has been drawn up of all recorded *codices* from the time of the oldest catalogues to the present day, including more than sixty now in existence, a dozen or so of which have been examined and reported upon, and a few, notably the Helmstadtensis 384 and the Vindobonensis 3509, laid under contribution for important results; and finally, a restatement has been made, with occasional corrections and elaborations, of the manuscript classification set up in part in the *Festschrift Joh. Vahlen* (1900), and in greater detail, under Vollmer's supervision, by his pupil Remme in a Munich dissertation (1906). All this has been done, it need scarcely be added, with that mastery of technique and critical acumen which is characteristic of Vollmer's work as an editor, and constitutes the most notable addition yet made to our knowledge of this text.